

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15, 17, 18, 20, and 23-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croy and Wakia. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Wakia teaches an in-flight passenger entertainment system for planes wherein the entertainment data is sent to individual seat units. These units are thus neither private or personal terminals of the passengers as described in the specification (page 5, lines 17-20, e.g.) and in the claims (claim 1, line 8; claim 23, line 2 and claim 28, lines 3-4). The seat units found in planes are dedicated terminals which would hardly be compatible with any other system.

The seat units of Wakai are integrated to the passengers seats and are connected to a wired distribution network. These units aren't portable terminals as claimed by the applicant.

Moreover, although the system described in Wakai may include some personal information about the passengers (col. 16, lines 42-47) this information doesn't include the passengers' travel authorizations, as is claimed for the terminals in independent claims 1, 23 and 28 of this application.

The patent to Croy describes a hand-held remote controller for an electronic device having a wireless interface. The remote controller is able to receive some specific data through its wireless interface, such as for example information about television programs, software updates for the remote controller, etc. The received data is mainly used for guiding the user in his/her selections. It is however not taught that the entertainment programs could be distributed through the remote controller, as compared to applicants system wherein the system distributes entertainment programs to the terminals, as claimed in independent claims 1, 23 and 28.

Therefore, even by combining the teachings of Wakai and Croy, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to arrive at the invention claimed herein. The combined teachings would result in an in-flight entertainment system where the entertainment data is sent to wired seat units controlled with a wireless remote controller.

Moreover, one skilled in the art would not have used teachings of Wakai as a base for finding the solution of the application, as it is well known that the use of

Appl. No. 09/998,281
Amdt. dated July 16, 2003
Reply to Office action of April 21, 2003

personal portable electronic equipment in a plane is highly restricted and even prohibited, particularly when the electronic equipment communicates over a wireless interface. The use of a portable phone is, for example, strictly prohibited, as it might interfere with the plane's guidance equipment.

The additional application of Laurysen (to claims 16 and 19) and Orlen (to claims 21 and 22) does not negate the patentability of these claims since they depend from allowable parent claims.

For the reasons set forth, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34183.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Thomas P. Schiller, Reg. No. 20677

526 Superior Avenue East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

July 16, 2003